

MINUTES
BROWN COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY
Monday, February 15, 2016, 3:00 p.m.
City Hall, 100 N. Jefferson Street, Room 604
Green Bay, WI 54301

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ann Hartman – Chair, Sup. Andy Nicholson – Vice-Chair, Corday Goddard, and Andy Williams

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Tom Deidrick

OTHERS PRESENT: Robyn Hallet, Pat Leifker, Casey Murphy, Mackenzie Reed-Kadow, Stephanie Schmutzer, Matt Roberts

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. Approval of the minutes from the January 18, 2016 meeting of the Brown County Housing Authority.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Williams to approve the minutes from the January 18, 2016 Brown County Housing Authority meeting. Motion carried.

COMMUNICATIONS:

REPORTS:

2. Report on Housing Choice Voucher Rental Assistance Program:

- A. Preliminary Applications

- P. Leifker reported that for the month of January there were 197 preliminary applications. C. Goddard inquired about the tremendous increase in applications compared to other years in January. P. Leifker explained that this is due to the mass lease up, which resulted in an increased number of applications starting in June to July of last year and has continued since.

- B. Unit Count

- The unit count for the month of January was 3,020.

- C. Housing Assistance Payments Expenses

- The HAP expenses amounted to \$1,216,366.

- D. Housing Quality Standard Inspection Compliance

- There were a total of 422 inspections, of which 289 passed the initial inspection, 35 passed the reevaluation, 68 resulted in a fail, and 30 were no-shows.

- E. Program Activity/52681B (administrative costs, portability activity, SEMAP)

P. Leifker stated that for the month of January there were 178 port outs with an associated HAP expense of \$148,803.51. The administrative expenses for ICS were underspent by \$5,570.62. The FSS program was overspent by \$3,561.02. P. Leifker stated the sole reason for this was due to HUD not releasing the funds to BCHA in a timely manner for the month of January. The administrative funds for FSS were received in February per request from the BCHA. Currently the FSS program is underspent.

F. Family Self-Sufficiency Program (client count, escrow accounts, graduates, participation levels, new contracts, and homeownership)

M. Reed-Kadow stated that 76 participants are currently enrolled in the FSS program. Of that number, 51 participants are at level one, six are in level two, 10 are in level three, and nine are in level four. C. Goddard noted that the trend of the distribution between the levels has been positive since the number of people in all four levels has been growing. A. Hartman inquired if the increase is due to the increase in the number of participants. M. Reed Kadow concurred stating that when participants graduate or leave the program affects the distribution. Two new contracts were established for the month of January. There were three graduates and zero terminations for the month of January.

M. Reed-Kadow relayed a success story of one of the participants, indicating that she had been on the program for almost four years. Within this time the graduate completed her degree and found a job with benefits in her field.

M. Reed-Kadow concluded the FSS report stating that there are currently 34 escrow accounts and 58 homeowners.

G. VASH Reports (active VASH, and new VASH)

P. Leifker stated that there are no new VASH clients for the month of January. Currently, there are 24 participants in the VASH program.

H. Langan Investigations Criminal Background Screening and Fraud Investigations

P. Leifker stated that for the month of January there were eight new investigations assigned, eight previous investigations were closed, and eight investigations are still active. There were 170 applications processed; of that number, 168 were approved and two were denied. P. Leifker summarized the Initial Applications by Municipality and Fraud Investigation by Municipality charts.

3. Report on use of Administrative Reserves and HCV lease up.

P. Leifker stated that this report is concerning the status of the ongoing lease up project since the approval of the use of Administrative reserve funds. He indicated that the first two tables showed the number of clients that have been pulled from the waiting list since the month of May 2015. He explained that of the number of vouchers issued, 298 recipients indicated that they wanted to port out of Brown County. A. Hartman interjected that this is 20 percent of the amount of vouchers issued. The third table

indicates the number of clients that are currently on the waiting list as of February 1st. He explained that the number is fairly low due to the previous data being recorded from late January. He stated that ICS has invoiced the total additional cost to the Authority, which totaled \$17,831.51.

A. Nicholson inquired about the non-preference category of the waiting list. P. Leifker explained that this is when an applicant applies to the program but resides outside of Brown County at the time of the application. This is the lowest preference ICS has. When someone is pulled from the non-preference list they must reside inside Brown County for one year and are unable to access portability until that 12 month period is complete. M. Roberts further explained that there have been recent occurrences in which applicants have been bypassing the residency period by closing out their non-preference applications once they have moved to Brown County, then reapplying as a Brown County resident, thus gaining a spot in the preference category of the ICS waiting list. P. Leifker clarified that HUD states ICS is unable to define a timeframe to determine residency and instead can only require certain documents in determining residency. ICS has more strict requirements than other Housing Authorities in determining residency in order to better serve the residents of Brown County. A. Nicholson asked if there was a large number of port outs within the non-preference section. P. Leifker explained that the non-preference applicants are aware of the 12 month residency requirements after receiving their voucher. R. Hallet clarified that many residents abide by the 12 month waiting period for portability and then port out as soon as they are able.

A. Williams inquired about the definitions within the non-preference list. P. Leifker explained that the preference list is arranged into specific rankings of displaced, elderly/disabled/homeless/veterans, families with minors, and finally singles, while the non-preference list is an all-inclusive category – any non-Brown County applicant is placed in the non-preference list, irrespective of being displaced, elderly/disabled/homeless/veteran, etc. A. Williams inquired about the required documents for determining residency. P. Leifker responded that applicants are required to provide a photo ID proving a current residence in Brown County and two other official records such as a lease, utility bill or school record, that coincide with the address on the photo ID. A. Williams inquired why ICS does not require a lease as a form of documentation. P. Leifker explained that in some cases applicants are not a party on the lease. For instance, someone who is living with their parents does not have a lease of their own. A. Williams raised concerns about the requirements for proof of address because of his personal knowledge of an instance in which person has created a false address by issuing a change of address with the post office to have their mail forwarded to an address within Brown County that they don't reside in. P. Leifker explained that in an effort to prevent mailing address fraud ICS uses the return service request envelopes. R. Hallet clarified that ICS also requires an updated state ID or driver's license through the DMV. A. Williams reported that the requirements for the DMV are not as strict as originally believed. For instance, a hunting license from Fleet Farm can be used to obtain a state driver's license.

R. Hallet allowed the board to recommend more rigid requirements. She also raised the concern of HUD's Fair Housing Act. She referenced an article was shared with her by A. Hartman that divulged information on a PHA that had rigorous residency requirements and is now under government scrutiny. The exact details of the actions taken by the PHA in question were not disclosed.

M. Roberts mentioned that a few weeks ago there was a meeting led by delegates of the Somalian community as well as Forward Services. At the end of the meeting, M. Roberts asked for an individual meeting between him the delegates and Forward Services to inquire about establishment and long term residency within Brown County. He explained that a report could be shared with the board of the questions asked and the responses given. A. Nicholson inquired about the status of citizenship of the Somalis who apply for housing. R. Hallet clarified that HUD requires voucher recipients be legal permanent residents, even if the applicant has not acquired a full citizenship status. Since many of these immigrants are refugees, they would generally have a status of legal permanent resident. M. Roberts stated that we do not inquire about or require proof of country of origin. The refugees do not have to be full citizens to receive housing benefits. A. Nicholson inquired about how permanent residency is determined. P. Leifker explained that this is determined through an online federal government system known as SAVE. Through the system certain information is provided from their permanent residency card and the system verifies the accuracy of it.

OLD BUSINESS:

4. Discussion and possible action regarding a request from a BCHA downpayment loan recipient.

R. Hallet provided a status update on the family who received a downpayment loan, but is unable to pay the amount back to the BCHA. In the meeting last month the Authority agreed to approach the family with a signature loan for the money owed to the BCHA. Currently there is an offer on the property. The buyers had a slight issue before the sale could be finalized, but now there is a closing of the sale scheduled for the end of this month. R. Hallet is waiting on a response from a letter she sent to the family about the signature loan. A. Hartman asked who the family will contact when the sale is closed. R. Hallet responded that she would be notified since she has to approve the satisfaction of mortgage.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by C. Goddard to receive and place on file the update to the status of the signature loan. Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS:

5. Review and approval of Resolution No. 16-01 certifying the Brown County Housing Authority Annual SEMAP submission for fiscal year ending December 31, 2015.

P. Leifker allowed the Authority to observe the SEMAP Projection spreadsheet. He explained this is a scorecard that BCHA/ICS has with HUD. Previously ICS was rated at 96 percent during the 2014 fiscal year. This year ICS is anticipating to be rated as a

high performer at 100 percent. The difference between the two years was the score of 98 percent in indicator #13, Lease Up. R. Hallet commended ICS on their performance. A. Hartman asked when the final scores will be announced. P. Leifker answered the scores will be announced in either April or May.

A motion was made by A. Williams and seconded by C. Goddard to approve Resolution 16-01. Motion carried.

6. Discussion and possible action regarding date and time of BCHA meetings.

R. Hallet opened up discussion on possible action regarding the time of the BCHA meetings. A. Hartman stated that concerns have been brought up by her neighbors that it is difficult to attend the BCHA meeting due to the time. Another concern from A. Hartman is that she works until 3:15 and A. Nicholson has to close his store early on the days of the BCHA meetings. She inquired if there is any flexibility in schedules of the Authority to amend the time of the meeting to 3:30 or 4 pm. R. Hallet clarified that the room in which the meeting takes place is reserved by another group at 5 pm. However, usually the BCHA meetings do not go to 5 pm. Commissioners inquired of the impact on others if the time changed to 3:30 pm. No Commissioners voiced any objections. S. Schmutzer explained that if the meeting goes beyond her allotted hours she will earn comp time. R. Hallet explained that there must be a change to the bylaws in order to change the time in which the BCHA has its meetings. Furthermore, the bylaws state that approval from the Authority is all that is required to enact a change to the bylaws. A. Williams indicated that approving the change of meeting time now is sufficient to change the bylaws; they do not need to be brought back at the next meeting for separate approval.

A motion was made by C. Goddard and seconded by A. Nicholson to change the BCHA meeting time to 3:30 pm on the third Monday of every month. Motion carried.

A motion was made by A. Williams and seconded by C. Goddard to amend the bylaws in order for the BCHA to meet at 3:30 pm on the third Monday of every month. Motion carried.

INFORMATIONAL:

7. Review of Roles & Responsibilities section of Lead the Way training.

R. Hallet presented the Roles & Responsibilities section of the Lead the Way training to the Authority and opened up for discussion. The members took the quiz of the Role & Responsibilities together. In the next meeting the Authority will go over Asset Management section.

BILLS:

S. Schmutzer explained that there is nothing of note to report.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by C. Goddard to accept the bill for this month. Motion carried.

FINANCIAL REPORT:

S. Schmutzer reported that TRIP funds will start coming in and the number recorded for fraud recovery will increase. S. Schmutzer allowed the Authority to observe the trial balance for the year of 2015. She noted that a couple of journal entries need to be documented to ensure that the funds for ICS are accurate for the trial balance in the case of an audit.

A motion was made by A. Nicholson and seconded by A. Williams to accept and place on file the financial report for this month. Motion carried.

STAFF REPORT:

8. Date of next meeting: March 21, 2016: Joint BCHA & ICS Board meeting, at ICS's office at 2605 S. Oneida St, Suite 106. Suggestions for agenda items welcomed.

A motion for adjournment was made by A. Nicholson, seconded by A. Williams. Motion carried. The BCHA meeting for February 16, 2016, adjourned at 3:41 pm.

CM:RAH:JD